

A Study of the GIMS User Language Course

by

Prepared for Information Systems Training Division  
Office of Training and Education

July 1985

This study was designed and conducted with the advice  
and assistance of:

## Executive Summary of a Study of the GIMS User Language Course

During the spring, 1985, staff members in ISTD conducted a study of the GIMS course because of the following projections: 1) training requirements for new GIMS users were thought to have become more complex over the last several years; 2) the GIMS course that is currently offered has changed little in the past five years; and, 3) the number of GIMS users is not likely to shift significantly while the IDMS/R system is phased into the Agency.

The purpose of the study was to determine whether or not there continues to be a need for a GIMS course; and, if so, to review and possibly redesign the present course to better meet the training specifications identified by current GIMS users and data base administrators.

The study was conducted as part of a series of program assessments within ISTD and in conjunction with the quarterly course review process of the OTE Curriculum Committee. The evaluation questions represent a consensus among ISTD staff and the Hadron contract instructors about the kinds of information necessary to determine the type and extent of GIMS training needed.

This study was based on data collected from: 1) trainees in GIMS courses offered in FY84 and the first quarter of FY85; and, 2) GIMS data base administrators.

Questionnaires were sent to all 308 trainees in the GIMS courses which were the basis for this study. Forty-eight questionnaires were returned because the trainee could not be located. One hundred eighty (180) questionnaires were completed and returned, constituting a response rate of 69.2%.

In addition, eleven interviews with data base administrators (DBA) were conducted by members of an informal task force created to guide the GIMS assessment. The sample of DBA's interviewed represented responsibilities for small, medium, and large GIMS systems within each of the Directorates.

In general, the results of the study indicate that:

- o a majority of the survey respondents were in their present job less than one year, had virtually no GIMS experience, and were still using GIMS at the time of the survey.
- o a majority use GIMS menus to enter data and regularly use single or related files for both canned and ad hoc queries.
- o there are two general types of GIMS users: those whose primary GIMS activity is data entry and those who mainly use GIMS to manipulate data and to write reports.
- o a majority of survey respondents are in positions which require clerical, word and/or data processing skills.
- o of the data base administrators interviewed, most tended to believe that GIMS users should have greater expertise in applying specific procedures (e.g. writing and formatting reports, using hitfiles, \$functions, when clauses, etc.).

Recommendations for future GIMS training include: collaborating with OIT to design and develop an Advanced GIMS Query Language Course; dividing the current GIMS course into a Menus Course and a Basic Query Language Course; and, developing procedures with Central Registration to ensure that the students are assigned to the appropriate course at the right time.

## Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Executive Summary	i
Introduction	1
Design of the Study	2
Sample	2
Methods and Procedures	4
Results	4
Survey Responses	4
General Characteristics	5
GIMS User Language	8
Summary and Conclusions	12
Recommendations for GIMS Training	13
Appendix A	
Appendix B	

## List of Tables

Table 1 - Demographic Characteristics of Trainees in 24 GIMS Courses	3
Table 2 - Frequency Distribution of Agency, Job, and GIMS Experience	5
Table 3 - Frequency Distribution for Background Characteristics of GIMS Users	6
Table 4 - Frequency Distribution for GIMS-Based Systems With Which Survey Respondents Work	7
Table 5 - Frequency Distribution for Use of GIMS Functions	9

## A STUDY OF THE GIMS USER LANGUAGE COURSE

### Introduction

Since October 1983, the GIMS User Language course has been offered by OTE approximately 16 times per year. The course is targeted for new GIMS users assigned to work with one (or more) of the Agency's GIMS-based systems. Coordinated and monitored by ISTD staff, GIMS is taught by Hadron contract instructors.

During the spring, 1985, staff in ISTD conducted a study of the GIMS course in order to determine whether or not there continues to be a need for a basic course in the GIMS User Language; and, if so, to review and possibly redesign the course.

The decision to assess the GIMS course systematically was based on three factors:

1. The training requirements for new users are apt to be varied, since there are currently 158 GIMS-based systems in the Agency.
2. The training methods and materials used in GIMS have remained virtually unchanged for the past five years.
3. OIT/MSG has recently decided to adapt an IDMS/R system and, as a consequence, to phase out over the next several years many of the GIMS-based systems.

Since the number of GIMS users is likely to remain large, and relatively stable, for the next few years, there is a clear need to examine the GIMS course to ensure that it meets the needs of the target audience. Our study was designed to address several separate but related questions:

- o To what extent is the GIMS User Language used on the job?
- o To what extent are GIMS menus used on the job?
- o What options are available for meeting the training needs of new GIMS users?

This study was conducted as part of a series of program assessments within ISTD and as part of the quarterly course review undertaken by the OTE Curriculum Committee. The evaluation questions represent a consensus of interests among ISTD staff and the Hadron contract instructors about the kinds of information necessary to determine the type and extent of GIMS training necessary to meet the Agency's need.

An informal GIMS evaluation task force composed of ISTD and OIT staff members, and a Hadron contract instructor, was created to guide the evaluation design and to review the final evaluation report.

The purpose of this report is to present our analyses of the data collected in response to the evaluation questions listed above. The report is divided into three sections. In the first, labeled "Design of the Study," the sample and procedures used in the study are described. In the second section, labeled "Results," findings from the study of the GIMS user language course are presented. In the last section of this report, labeled "Recommendations for GIMS Training," observations and suggestions are made regarding ways in which the Agency can meet requirements for GIMS training over the next several years.

### Design of the Study

This study is based on data collected from two sources: (1) Participants in the 24 GIMS courses offered in FY 84, and the first quarter of FY85; and, (2) GIMS data base administrators.

Data from the course participants were gathered from a questionnaire; information from data base administrators was collected through interviews.

### Sample

In the 24 GIMS courses offered from October 1983 to March 1985, there were 308 trainees. As indicated in Table 1, on the next page, the majority of these trainees were female, from the DDA, and at the GS-05 - GS-09 level.

TABLE 1

Demographic Characteristics of Trainees  
in 24 GIMS Courses (n=308)

<u>Demographic Characteristics</u>	<u>(n) of Students</u>	<u>% of Students</u>
<u>Directorate</u>		
DCI	12	3.9
DDA	159	51.6
DDI	40	13.0
DDO	49	15.9
DDS&T	43	14.0
ICS	4	1.3
Unknown	1	0.3
<u>Gender</u>		
Male	98	31.8
Female	209	67.9
Unknown	1	0.3
<u>GS Grade Level</u>		
03	1	0.3
04	12	3.9
05	43	14.0
06	55	17.9
07	64	20.8
08	37	12.0
09	32	10.4
10	16	5.2
11	12	3.9
12	10	3.2
13	16	5.2
14	5	1.6
15	4	1.3
SIS	-	-
Unknown	1	0.3

## Method and Procedures

The paper-and-pencil survey questionnaire method was used to obtain data from Agency employees who had taken GIMS training in the past 18 months. A set of questions was designed initially by ISTD staff members and reviewed by members of the task force created informally to guide the study.

On 2 May 1985, 308 GIMS survey packets were sent through the Agency mail. The survey packets contained the questionnaire, a memo from the Chief, ISTD, describing the purpose of the evaluation, and a self-addressed return envelope. A reminder memo was sent to each of the 308 course participants two weeks later. A copy of the questionnaire, cover memo, and reminder memo are presented in Appendix A.

In addition, eleven interviews were conducted by members of the task force with GIMS data base administrators as well with the OIT GIMS coordinator. The individuals to be interviewed were selected from a list of all GIMS systems and data bases according to two criteria:

- o Approximate and relative size of the GIMS systems.
- o Directorate for which the system was developed.

With respect to the size of the system, a representative sample of large, medium, and small systems was sought. Also, at least two data base administrators in each directorate were contacted. It should be noted, however, that the data base administrators interviewed for this study represent a logical, rather than a stratified random, sample.

## Results

### Survey Responses

Of the 308 survey questionnaires mailed out, 43 were returned unopened because the trainee was not at the address, and 5 were returned because the trainee was no longer with the Agency. A total of 180 questionnaires were completed and returned to ISTD before 31 May 1985. Thus, of the 260 potential survey respondents, 180 responses constitutes a rate of 69.2%. As with similar kinds of surveys, a response rate between 1/2 to 2/3 of the target population is considered to be quite adequate.



### General Characteristics

In order to describe the general background of GIMS users who took the course, three questions were asked: How long have you been with the Agency?; How long have you worked in your present job? How long have you been a GIMS user? In Table 2, below, a frequency distribution of survey responses is presented for each question.

Table 2

Frequency Distribution of Agency, Job, and  
GIMS Experience Among Survey Respondents (n=180)

Years of Experience	Type of Experience					
	Agency		Current Job		GIMS	
	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%
0 - 1	24	13.3	109	60.6	109	60.5
2 - 3	56	31.1	48	26.7	58	32.2
4 - 6	24	13.3	11	6.1	7	3.9
7 - 10	28	15.6	5	2.8	4	2.2
11 - 15	15	8.3	4	2.2	2	1.1
16 - 20	14	7.8	2	1.1	--	--
Over 20	19	10.6	1	0.6	--	--

The data in Table 2 indicate that an overwhelming majority of the respondents were in their present job less than one year and had virtually no prior GIMS experience. Additionally, 44% of the respondents have fewer than 4 years Agency experience. In sum, the GIMS course can be considered to be serving new GIMS users - the target group for which the course was originally intended.

A frequency distribution for background characteristics of GIMS users is presented below in Table 3.

Table 3

Frequency Distribution for Background  
Characteristics of GIMS Users (n=180)

---

<u>Item</u>	<u>Choice</u>	<u>(n)</u>	<u>%</u>
Approximately how many other GIMS users are there in your immediate office area?	None	13	7.2
	A Few(1-4)	67	37.2
	Some (5-15)	41	22.8
	Many	46	25.6
	N/A	13	7.2
Is there a terminal in your immediate office?	Yes	143	79.4
	No	37	20.5
Is there a terminal in your work area/work station?	Yes	160	88.9
	No	20	11.1
Is a terminal convenient for you?	Yes	142	78.9
	No	38	21.1
Did you use GIMS before you took GIMS?	Yes	103	57.2
	No	77	42.8
Did you use VM before you took GIMS?	Yes	84	46.7
	No	96	53.3
Did you use another system before you took GIMS?	Yes	79	43.9
	No	101	56.1
Have you taken other GIMS-based courses (e.g., CAMS, PRIM)?	Yes	6	3.3
	No	174	96.7
Have you taken other GIMS courses (e.g. OIT ADP GIMS courses)?	Yes	25	13.9
	No	155	86.1

---

The data in Table 3 indicate that GIMS users do not tend to be isolated; rather they most frequently work with a number of other GIMS users. In addition, they tend to have a terminal in their immediate office or work area.

With respect to GIMS-related training taken prior to the GIMS course, approximately one-half of the respondents had used GIMS before taking the GIMS course; but very few respondents had taken other GIMS or GIMS-based courses.

Overall, the data in Tables 2 and 3 indicate that the survey respondents are indeed representative of those for whom the GIMS course was designed. It should be noted that since most of the respondents are not the only GIMS users in an office, some preliminary on-the-job training in GIMS must have occurred prior to the course.

Responses to the question "What is the GIMS-based system with which you work?" show that approximately 1/3 of the trainees are using GIMS systems other than those listed. Of those listed, the largest number of respondents use GAS (General Accounting System). The number and percent of respondents for nine GIMS systems listed in the questionnaire are presented below in Table 4.

---

Table 4

Frequency Distribution for GIMS-Based Systems  
With Which Survey Respondents Work (n=180)\*

<u>System</u>	<u>(n)</u>	<u>%</u>
PRIM	9	5.0
CAMS2	6	3.3
TRIS	6	3.3
SIMS	3	1.7
GAS	23	12.8
FRS	3	1.7
ICS	7	3.9
MEDANE	2	1.1
LIMS	3	1.7
OTHER	61	33.9
Not Using GIMS	54	30.0
Don't Know	3	1.7

---

\* Of the 180 respondents, 29 use two systems and 6 use 3 systems.

---

The data in Table 4 indicate that about 30% of the respondents are not GIMS users (within 18 months of having taken the course). This percentage is surprisingly high.

#### GIMS User Language

The second section of the survey questionnaire was designed to estimate the extent to which trainees use particular elements in the GIMS User Language. Since approximately 30% of the survey respondents noted that they were no longer using GIMS, these data were analyzed only for those 134 respondents currently working with a GIMS System. The items in the second section were based on a 5-point frequency scale, with "I don't know" as well as "Not Applicable" alternatives. For the purposes of our study, however, no practical distinctions were made between responses in the "nearly every day" and "at least several times a week" categories, or between "once a month" and "can count the number of times" categories. As a consequence, the data are presented here in four categories: Frequently (ratings 1 and 2), Occasionally (ratings 3 and 4), DK (I don't know), and NA (not applicable). A frequency distribution for use of selected GIMS functions is presented in Table 5.

Table 5

A Frequency Distribution for  
Use of GIMS Functions (n=134)

	Frequently		Occasionally		DK		NA	
	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%
Use Agency Terminal	112	(83.6)	21	(15.7)	--		1	(0.7)
Input w/menus	74	(55.2)	45	(33.6)	1	(0.7)	14	(10.4)
Canned queries	55	(41.0)	44	(32.8)	11	(8.2)	24	(17.9)
Ad hoc queries	47	(35.1)	48	(35.8)	11	(8.2)	31	(23.1)
ReportW	15	(11.2)	39	(29.1)	12	(8.9)	68	(50.7)
Access Dictionary	14	(10.4)	50	(37.3)	8	(6.0)	62	(46.3)
Single file	38	(28.4)	38	(28.4)	16	(11.9)	40	(29.8)
Related files	33	(24.6)	38	(28.4)	16	(11.9)	40	(29.8)
Nonrelated files								
Same DB	15	(11.2)	37	(27.6)	21	(15.7)	57	(42.5)
When	15	(11.2)	51	(38.1)	15	(11.2)	52	(38.8)
Arith ops	14	(10.4)	40	(29.8)	11	(8.2)	68	(50.7)
\$Functions	10	(7.5)	53	(39.5)	7	(5.2)	69	(51.5)
Translate	6	(4.5)	38	(28.4)	11	(8.2)	81	(60.4)
Link files	7	(5.2)	41	(30.6)	13	(9.7)	73	(54.5)
Hitfile	13	(9.7)	44	(32.8)	13	(9.7)	68	(50.7)
Route printer	41	(30.6)	62	(46.3)	3	(2.2)	28	(20.9)
Format output	13	(9.7)	44	(32.8)	8	(6.0)	69	(51.5)
Use course material	15	(11.2)	96	(71.6)	3	(2.2)	20	(14.9)
GIMS Ref	20	(14.9)	93	(69.4)	4	(3.0)	17	(12.7)
Update	36	(26.9)	48	(35.8)	7	(5.2)	43	(32.1)

In Table 5 the data indicate, first of all, that approximately 99% of the trainees are currently using an Agency terminal at least several times a week. Secondly, of all the GIMS functions listed, the greatest number of former trainees use menus to enter data.

Also, at least half of the respondents noted that some GIMS functions were not used on their jobs. In particular, these functions are: ReportW, arithmetic operators, \$functions, translate, link files, hitfiles and formatting output. For some respondents, however, "not applicable" may have represented a catch-22 situation. That is, the supervisor knows the trainee does not know how to use "ReportW," for example, so the trainee receives no ReportW assignments. Then, on a questionnaire such as the one used in this study, the trainee accurately marks "N/A" for ReportW because none of his tasks have required using that function.

To further identify which GIMS functions represent content essential for a GIMS training course, members of the informal GIMS evaluation task force interviewed 11 GIMS data base administrators (DBA). Each DBA was asked three questions:

- (1) What kinds of problems/questions do your GIMS users typically have?
- (2) What recurring requests do you get?
- (3) If you were to design training for your GIMS users, what knowledge, skills, or topics would you definitely include?

Opinions expressed by the data base administrators to each of the questions are as follows:

QUESTION 1: Our GIMS users typically have problems/questions with...

Understanding menus, and the corresponding file structures;

Using menus to make changes in data;

Queries which combine more than one field;

Segmented fields;

Document control;

Multiple, complex selections, when clause;

Information retrieval.

QUESTION 2: Recurring requests for...

Help with queries;

What to do to remedy error messages;

Explanations of why and how particular functions work because our users have little knowledge of either their files or GIMS systems;

Reports;

Assistance with manipulating and/or moving data.

QUESTION 3: A GIMS course for my users should definitely contain instruction in...

ReportW, listings, formatting and labeling output (cf., the topics which are currently covered in the OIT DBA class, but not taught in the OTE GIMS user course);

Ad hoc queries;

When clause;

Linking lists within data bases;

Using menus effectively and efficiently;

Concatenated data elements;

Hitfiles;

Data base specific functions;

Document control and registries;

\$functions;

Extracting data to tape and disk for concentrated use.

In addition, each of the DBA's emphasized the need for practice exercises relevant to the trainees' data base. Virtually all of the DBA's noted that training was perhaps the single most critical aspect of fully utilizing a GIMS data base. Most DBA's, however, remarked that the present GIMS course was inadequate for training on their systems and suggested that application-specific training would be ideal.

#### Summary and Conclusions

Considering both the survey data and the interview comments, there are some general findings. First, since an overwhelming majority of survey respondents are not only new to their position but also new to GIMS, the GIMS course has apparently been serving the target audience for whom it was initially intended. However, this audience seems to be of two distinct types:

1) those whose job is primarily data entry, requiring facile use of GIMS menus; and, 2) those who use the GIMS language to manipulate data and write reports.

Second, the major job activities of the survey respondents cluster around word processing, clerical, and data processing; hence, the data entry category of GIMS users is believed to represent about half of the population. (The number and percent of respondents in each job category is presented in Appendix B.)

A third finding is the pattern of survey responses to the question dealing with the use of more sophisticated GIMS capabilities (cf., Table 5). Beyond entering data through menus, querying the data base with either canned or ad hoc GIMS statements or referring to GIMS reference material, approximately half of the survey respondents do not use any of the other GIMS capabilities listed in the questionnaire. From the DBA perspective, however, it would appear that expertise in such specific procedures as writing and formatting reports, using hitfiles, \$functions, when clauses, etc., would be especially useful.



In addition, while most of the DBA's urged consideration of more GIMS applications-specific training, only seven of the trainees surveyed mentioned that need. Instead, the trainees simply tended to recall that a course was "good."

Overall, our study seems to corroborate the perception that a broad introductory course for all new GIMS users, while necessary, may not be sufficient.

### Recommendations for GIMS Training

Data from the surveys and the interviews suggest two types of GIMS users: those who enter data and those who manipulate data to answer particular questions and/or write reports. In addition, our study indicates that among the latter group there is a subgroup of sophisticated users who rely on GIMS to accomplish more complex tasks.

As a consequence, we recommend that the current GIMS user language course be deleted from the ISTD course offerings. In its stead, we suggest the following:

a. A half-day GIMS Menus course, which would be offered once a month. This course would include such things as signing-on to GIMS and accessing a variety of menus to retrieve data and/or update files. GIMS menus should be developed with the assistance of the user community in order to present examples and exercises relevant to particular types of users (e.g., personnel and document registry).

b. A one and one-half day GIMS Basic Query Language course, which would be offered about once every six weeks. This course would include signing on to GIMS, using the elementary GIMS capabilities (e.g., list, count, total, single and multiple record selection), as well as writing queries using simple with, when and comparison statements.

c. A two and one-half day GIMS Advanced Query Language course, which would be offered four times a year. This course should include instruction in ReportW, formatting output, parent-child relationships, accessing dictionaries, linking files, and writing complicated queries using global when statements and modifiers.

For the GIMS Menus and Basic Query Language courses the single prerequisite (beyond a job-related-need-for-training) should be a GIMS userid. In contrast, for the Advanced Query Language course, the prerequisite should be the Basic Query Language course and/or demonstrated proficiency. In addition, ISTD should work closely with Central Registration to ensure that all students are enrolled in the appropriate class based on their work requirements and level of experience.

All three of the proposed courses should be developed in collaboration with both the GIMS user community and OIT. In addition, the registration procedures and "PR" materials associated with implementing the proposed GIMS courses should be developed in close coordination with Central Registration and the Senior Training Officers.

In summary, given that many of the GIMS systems will be phased into IDMS/R systems over the next five years, traditional classroom instruction is considered to be the most cost effective way to meet the GIMS training requirement.

GIMS instructional packages are not available from commercial vendors; and, since the need for GIMS training will diminish over time, GIMS is not a strong candidate for a computer-based training effort.

Whether or not the GIMS course is redesigned, we recommend that OTE/ISTD receive assurance from OIT that the space allocated on the GIMS Development system is sufficient for each and every offering of a GIMS course. This assurance is critical because it is the "hands-on" classroom exercises which afford the student the most meaningful and efficient learning opportunity.

## APPENDIX A

2 May 1985

MEMORANDUM FOR: GIMSII Trainees

FROM:

Chief, Information Systems  
Training Division, OTE

SUBJECT:

Evaluation of the GIMS II  
User Language Course

1. The Information Systems Training Division (ISTD) in the Office of Training and Education is evaluating the GIMS II course in order to identify: a) ways in which the course meets the skill requirements of GIMS users; and, b) ways in which the course could be modified during the summer of 1985.

2. Therefore, we are asking all Agency employees who completed the GIMSII course in the last 18 months to participate, anonymously, in our evaluation.

3. Enclosed are a questionnaire and a pre-addressed envelope. Our assessment will reflect the views of the group of GIMSII trainees, and no comments will be attributed to an individual. To assure that your privacy will be protected, please do not sign or otherwise identify your questionnaire.

4. We are hopeful that you will be able to complete this questionnaire in about 15 minutes and that you will return it no later than 24 May 1985. The results of this evaluation will be analyzed in June; and we will send you an executive summary of the evaluation findings in July, 1985.

5. Thank you in advance for your cooperation with this effort to improve the quality of the GIMSII course we are delivering in ISTD.

Enclosure  
as stated

## GIMSII QUESTIONNAIRE

I. General Information.

1. In what component do you work? \_\_\_\_\_
2. How long have you been with the Agency? \_\_\_\_\_ years.  
How long have you worked in your present job? \_\_\_\_\_ years.
3. How long have you been a GIMS-user? \_\_\_\_\_ years.
4. Approximately how many other GIMS users are there in your immediate office area?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ a few (1 to 4)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ some (more than 5 but less than 15)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ many (almost everyone I work with uses GIMS)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ I don't know how many there are
5. Is there a terminal in your immediate office? YES\_\_NO\_\_
6. Is there a terminal in a work area/work station in your branch? YES\_\_NO\_\_  
Is a terminal convenient for you? YES\_\_NO\_\_
7. Did you use GIMS before you took GIMSII? YES\_\_NO\_\_
8. Did you use VM before you took GIMSII? YES\_\_NO\_\_
9. Did you use another system (e.g. Wang, Apple, etc) before you took GIMSII? YES\_\_NO\_\_
10. Have you taken other GIMS-based courses (eg. CAMS 2, PRIM, etc.)? NO\_\_\_\_\_ If yes, please list:  
 \_\_\_\_\_
11. Have you taken other GIMS courses (eg. OIT ADP GIMS courses? NO\_\_\_\_\_ If yes, please list: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
12. What is the GIMS-based system with which you work?  
(Please check all that apply.)

\_\_\_\_\_ PRIM  
 \_\_\_\_\_ CAMS2  
 \_\_\_\_\_ TRIS  
 \_\_\_\_\_ SIMS  
 \_\_\_\_\_ GAS  
 \_\_\_\_\_ FRS  
 \_\_\_\_\_ ICS  
 \_\_\_\_\_ MEDANE  
 \_\_\_\_\_ LIMS  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Other (Please specify)  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_ I am not currently using  
 a GIMS-based system

II. GIMSII Use. Please use the scale below to indicate how often you typically use each of the following in your job:

- 1 = virtually all the time (nearly every day)
- 2 = frequently (at least several times a week)
- 3 = sometimes (usually several times a month)
- 4 = rarely (once a month)
- 5 = hardly ever (can count the number of times)
- ? = I don't know
- NA= Not Applicable

TO WHAT EXTENT DO YOU NOW :

use an Agency Terminal?	1	2	3	4	5	?	NA
input data using GIMS menus?	1	2	3	4	5	?	NA
use GIMS queries (canned)?	1	2	3	4	5	?	NA
use GIMS queries (ad hoc)?	1	2	3	4	5	?	NA
use Report W?	1	2	3	4	5	?	NA
access Dictionaries?	1	2	3	4	5	?	NA
work with a single file?	1	2	3	4	5	?	NA
work with related files?	1	2	3	4	5	?	NA
work with non-related files on the same data base	1	2	3	4	5	?	NA
use the when clause?	1	2	3	4	5	?	NA
use Arithmetic operators?	1	2	3	4	5	?	NA
use modifiers (e.g. \$PF, \$PIC)	1	2	3	4	5	?	NA
translate	1	2	3	4	5	?	NA
link files	1	2	3	4	5	?	NA
use hitfiles	1	2	3	4	5	?	NA
route GIMS work to a printer	1	2	3	4	5	?	NA
format output for large files	1	2	3	4	5	?	NA
use your GIMS course material	1	2	3	4	5	?	NA
use GIMS reference material	1	2	3	4	5	?	NA
update/change your data base	1	2	3	4	5	?	NA

III. General Assessment.

1. Why did you take the GIMSII User Language course?

2. What is your general recollection of your GIMSII course? Did you get the information and/or skills you needed to do your job? If you didn't get what you needed, what topics would have been particularly useful for you?

2. If you were to categorize the nature of your work, which of the following would represent the closest approximation?

- ☐ budgeting (preparing and reviewing budgets)
- ☐ analysis (graphic, images, information, etc.)
- ☐ supervising (scheduling work, supervise, report on projects)
- ☐ word processing (typing)
- ☐ programming (systems, computers)
- ☐ clerical (copy documents, fill in forms, retrieve information, prepare mail)
- ☐ data processing (enter, edit, retrieve, interpret data)
- ☐ writing (write & revise reports, prepare briefings, read)
- ☐ instructing

Thank you for your participation in our study of GIMSII.

10 May 1985

MEMORANDUM FOR: GIMSII Trainees

FROM:

Chief, Information Systems  
Training Division, OTE

SUBJECT: The GIMSII Survey Questionnaire

1. If you have already completed and returned a questionnaire about your GIMSII User Language course, please disregard this note.

2. However, if you have not yet had an opportunity to answer the survey questions, please delay no longer.

3. In order to have confidence that the results of this study represent the views of GIMS users, we need as many people as possible to respond to the survey.

4. We will begin our analysis of the data immediately after the Memorial holiday, so we are hoping your questionnaire will be returned no later than 24 May 1985.

5. Thank you in advance for your participation in this evaluation effort.



## **APPENDIX B**

---

APPENDIX B  
Frequency Distribution of Survey Respondents  
in Job Categories (n=180)\*

<u>Category</u>	<u>(n)</u>	<u>%</u>
Budgeting	8	4.4
Analysis	19	10.6
Supervisory	14	7.8
Word Processing	20	11.1
Program	17	9.4
Clerical	38	21.1
Data Processing	45	25.0
Writing	5	2.8
Instructing	1	0.6
Other	10	5.6
missing	3	1.7

\* NOTE:

Fifty eight respondents cited 2 job activities and 27 cited 3. Of these, over 70% were in the clerical and data processing categories.

---